

Whig And Tory
PRINCIPLES
OF
GOVERNMENT
Fairly STATED;
IN A
DIALOGUE
BETWEEN AN
OXFORD SCHOLAR
AND A
WHIG PARSON.

Printed in the Year 1716.

And

PRINCIPLES

GOVERNMENT



DIALOGUE

BETWEEN AN

OXFORD SCHOLAR

AND A

WHIG PARSON

Printed in the Year 1710

Whig And Tory
PRINCIPLES
O F
GOVERNMENT
Fairly STATED,

In a **DIALOGUE** between an **Oxford**
SCHOLAR and a **Whig PARSON**,

Scholar **M**R. Parson your humble Servant.

Whig. Good Mr. ----- I am yours. How
are all our Old Friends at Oxford?

Sch. Troth just as you left them, they are the **Old**
Men still.

Wh. Stanch **Tories** I warrant you! Are **Non-Resist-**
ance and **Passive Obedience** still topping Doctrines
there?

Sch. Why, I thought every Body, even the
Whigs themselves had of late preached up **Non-**
Resistance.

(4)
Resistance, for I am told none condemn the late Insurrection more than thy do.

Wh. The *Whigs* did justify the Insurrections in former Reigns, but condemn the late Rebellion. Allow me to distinguish, for I am still of the same Opinion you found me last time we were together; I say then the *Whigs* by their Principles, may not only resist a Government when it goes about to Tyrannise by encroaching upon their Liberty and Privileges, but also to call the King and his Ministers to an Account, and even punish them as they deserve, but the *Tories* have no such Right, for they can in no Case resist under the dreadful pain of eternal Damnation, as they fondly believe.

Sch. I am surprised to find your Distinction so contrary to common Sense and the Principles of our excellent Church, especially from One of your Character in it; but I confess you are not singular, many of a higher Order teaching the same Doctrine, I shall only name one Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, now Bishop of ----- who has been at no small Pains to propagate such pernicious Principles, both from the Press and Pulpit.

Wh. Hold, Sir, you go too fast, it is not fair to be too hasty in condemning, the *Whigs* are a strong Party in the Nation, and want not Arguments to support their Principles.

Sch. Sir, I beg pardon if I have offended you, but truly to be plain with you, I have considered their Arguments, and still remain Proof against them, the strongest that I know they have, is the *Axe and Halber at Prestoun.*

Wh. I hope better Things of you, and would fain persuade my self that I am able to make you alter

alter your Opinion, if you'll have but a little Pa-
tience to hear and consider what I have to say, for
I design to try the strength of your Intellects, not
of your Body.

Ans. I promise it, and so you may proceed, but
allow me to make Answer to every Point as you
go along.

Wth. That cannot be denied. I begin then
with the Original of Government, which I have
often preached and seen printed, and assert that
it flows from the People, for Parliaments as well
as Kings are accountable to them, as deriving
their Authority from the People. And therefore,
that, as Parliaments being the Representatives of
the People, may depose Kings, so the People
may depose both Kings and Parliaments. And
tho' the King and the two Houses of Parliament
are the Constitution, the People have thought fit to
set up, yet that, the People are not so tyed up to
this, but that in Cases of Extremity, they may
take other Methods. Thus at the Revolution the
People made a Convention, and that Convention
after turned it self into a Parliament, to restore the
primitive Constitution. But that you may not
rely on my bare Word, I will produce good
Authorities, and refer you to them, and the
Practice of former Times in this Kingdom, of
which you cannot be ignorant. See then for your
Satisfaction these most excellent Treatises, *Junius
Brutus*, *Lex Rex*, *Pryn's Sovereign Power of Par-
liaments*, *Naphibali*, *Jus Populi Vindicatum*, *Mil-
ton's Apology*, *Plato Redivivus*, *Julian the Apostat*,
De Eo's Reviews, and *Jure Divino*, the *Observers*,
Ben. Hadly's Sermon, and Measures of Submission,
with many others I could name, all whose Argu-
ments

ments are so strong and convincing, that it is next to impossible for any Man of Sense, that duly considers them, not to be thoroughly convinced. To understand political Power a right, and derive it from its Original, we must consider what State all Men are naturally in, and that is a State of perfect Freedom to order their Actions, and dispose of their Possessions and Persons as they think fit, without asking leave or depending upon the Will of any other Man. A State also of Equality, wherein all the Power and Jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another, there being nothing more evident, than that Creatures of the same Species and Rank promiscuously born to all the use of the same Faculties, should also be equal one amongst another without Subordination or Subjection, unless the Lord or Master of them all should by a manifest Declaration of his Will set one above another, and confer on him by an evident and clear Appointment an undoubted Right to Dominion and Sovereignty. I ask then how the Magistrate comes to his Right of Dominion if not from the People by mutual Compact and Agreement.

Sch. I answer, By the positive Institution of God and the Dictate of Nature, for the Original of Government, and the Magistrates Right of Dominion, as I understand it, was pursuant to the Dictate of Nature; yet I place it not altogether there, but chiefly in the positive Institution of God, which renders it clear and indisputable. Thus tho' there were more Arguments from Nature for the Subjection of *Eve* to *Adam*, than of any Wife to a Husband, since, because she was made out of him, yet God left it not there, but said to her, *Gen. 3.*

16. *Thy desire shall be (or thou shalt be subject) to thy Husband, and he shall rule over thee.* Here is the first Government among Mankind. For, can any shew another Original, or any Government before this?

And here you may observe, that the common saying, of *Kings being made for the Subject, and not Subjects for Kings*, was not so from the beginning, for the first Subject was made for the Use and Benefit of the King; and it was for the benefite of the Subject too, as it is still to be obedient to their Governours; but the King was first.

And could *Eve*, who was thus made subject to *Adam*, have any Authority equal with him over their Children?

I mention this, because the celebrated *Mr. Lock* in his two (very trifling) *Discourses of Government*, printed 1698, (and so admired by the *Whigs*) labours the Point (in *Odium* to Monarchy) that the Power of the Wife was equal to that of the Husband over their Children, because it was said, *Honour thy Father and Mother.*

St. Paul lays stress upon *Adam*, being first formed, then *Eve*, and thence argues, that the Wife ought not to usurp Authority over the Husband, but to be in Subjection, *1 Tim. 2. 12, 13.* that is, that things should go according to the first Original; and the same Argument will hold as to King and Subject, for the King was first formed, then his Subjects, therefore they ought not to usurp Authority over him, but to be in Subjection.

What wretched stuff then is all that Chatter which we hear of the Peoples being the Original of Government, and chusing the first King, prescribing him Laws; &c. one would think these Men had
never

never read the three first Chapters of *Genesis*. And further, the Magistrate being called the Minister of God by *St. Paul*, hath none above him upon Earth to Question, Censure, or Punish him, and is accountable to none but God.

Wh. Against that Position of yours, I offer the following Reasons, 1. The Magistrate is called the Minister of God for Good, therefore if he does Evil he is no more the Minister of God, nor to be obeyed as such, but to be resisted as the Minister of the Devil. 2. Every Person in the World, who is the Instrument of Good to us, is the Minister of God to us for Good. 3. Ecclesiastical Officers who have a Commission from God, may be punished by the Civil Magistrate, therefore it doth not follow, that there is none upon Earth to Question, Censure, or Punish such as have a Divine Commission, and that the Magistrate is not Superior to us when he acts without or against his Commission, I exemplify thus, a Commission given to a Major, makes him not Superior to any in the Corporation, unless it be in the due Execution of the Office he is called to, nor will the Superior Government Censure or Punish any free Man for opposing this Major in any Cases but those to which his Commission relate; nor doth the King or Queen exempt him from an Equality in other Instances; and in all Cases where the Danger is imminent, Violence is to be repelled with Violence, and the same Behaviour which is allowed in the Case of Equality. 4. Inferiour or deputed Magistrates are the Ministers of God, but they may be punished by the superior Magistrates who deputed them: Therefore, that being the Minister of God, does not exempt a Man from

from Punishment, even by Men in this World. 5.
Put the Case of habitual or actual Madness in a
Father who would kill his Children, they may
tye his Hands and practise Self-defence, and so
of Kings and all other Magistrates.

Sch. To all these Reasons I answer severally
and distinctly : To the *First*, That St. Paul calling
the Magistrate *the Minister of God*, refers to his
Commission, which is from God, and saying
that he is a Minister of God for Good, respects his Of-
fice, which was instituted of God for the Good
of Men, and shews what the Magistrate ought to
do. But if he does it not, he is guilty of Male-
administration, the Apostle says not, *that he forfeits his*
Office, or ought to be resisted ; but on the contrary,
that to resist is *Damnation*, as being a resisting the
Ordinances of God. And it cannot be supposed but
that the Apostle had this in his view when he
spoke of the *Higher Powers* then in being, who
were profess'd *Enemies to Christ*, who *blasphem'd and*
persecuted Him ; if you can think there was any
Male-administration in that, or in *Pilat's* con-
demning Christ when he declar'd him innocent,
yet even then, and in that very Act *Christ* own'd
his Power to be from Heaven ; and St. Paul secures
the Magistrate not only from *Resistance*, but so much
as *Reproach*, even when judging him contrary to
the Law, *Act. 23. 3. 5.* And the Case is rul'd
in express Terms against you, when we are com-
manded to submit not only to the *Good and Gentle*,
but also to the *Froward*, and even when we suffer
wrongfully and for Well-doing, *1 Pet. 2. 18, 19, 20.*
And that you may see how the Church of *Eng-
land* understands this Doctrine, the Case is put
in the Second Part of the Homily against *Rebellion*.

of a Prince *hated of God, and God's Enemy*, and therefore likely not to prosper either in War or Peace, but to be hurtful and pernicious to the *Common-wealth*. Of an unkind Prince, neither considering or regarding our true, faithful and painful Service, or the Safe-guard of our Posterity. Of a Prince, our known mortal and deadly Enemy, that seeketh our Lives. And in all these Cases the Homily determining positively against *Resistance*. Then puts this Question, *What shall we do then to an evil, to an unkind Prince, an Enemy to us, hated of God, hurtful to the Common-wealth, &c.* And the Answer is in these Words, *Lay no violent Hand upon him* saith good David, *but let him live until God appoint and work his End, either by natural Death, or in War by lawful Enemies, not by traiterous Subjects.* ----- Surely no mortal Man can express with Words, nor conceive in Mind, the horrible and most dreadful Damnation that such be worthy of, who disdaining to be the quiet and happy Subjects of their good Prince, are worthy to be the miserable Captives, and vile Slaves of that infernal Tyrant *Satan*, and with him to suffer eternal Slavery and Torments. All this you have subscrib'd, and this very Homily is particularly nam'd and appointed to be read every 30th of *January*, or else that he who officiates shall compose a Sermon upon the same Argument; how you have observed this *Rubrick* may be worthy the Enquiry of your Superiors. I further Reply, That the worst Governour that ever was, is a Terror to many evil Works, and infinitely more for the Good of the People, than Rebellion, Civil War, or Monarchy. 2. To your second Reason I Answer, That it seems a perfect Jest, or betrays great want of Understanding,

and ing, that you cannot distinguish betwixt being an
 or instrument of Good to any Man (as helping him
 the out of a Ditch, or giving him a Shilling) and be-
 con- ing the Minister of God to execute Vengeance, &c.
 gain- this is Banter.----- 3. To your third Reason, I
 Of Answer, That Ecclesiastick Persons are subject to
 the Civil Power, and as such punishable by it.
 emy, But this touches not their Spiritual Authority,
 Cases which they derive from *Christ* alone, and is subject
 ance. to no Power upon Earth. That the Person of a
 en to Magistrate is made superior to those under his
 ed of Jurisdiction, by the Commission he has received,
 the and any Violence or Affront offered to him, even
 Hand in the undue Execution of his Commission, is just-
 until ly punishable. Any who think themselves ag-
 death, griev'd by him may appeal to a higher Authority,
 objects. but they are obliged to do it in the Form pre-
 with scrib'd, and not to make themselves Judges when
 and he transgresses his Commission, far less to offer
 y of, any Violence or Indignity to him, for that re-
 objects flects upon the Commission, and on him who
 rable granted it. But why should not you who make
 tyrant the People Superior to Kings, put them upon an
 y and Equality, and Level with inferior Magistrates ? 4.
 I this To your fourth Reason, I Reply, That all Magi-
 nted rates Act by divine Commission, but in Subordi-
 at he nation the Lower is answerable to the Higher, till
 n the you come to the Highest, which is the King, and
 this he is answerable to none but God, from whom he
 super- receiv'd his Commission. This is plainly told us,
 rnour *Pet. 2. 13. That we were to submit whether to the*
 Works, *King as Supreme, or unto Governours as unto them that*
 people, *are sent by him.* 5. To your fifth Reason, I Answer,
 2. To That the Case of Madnes in a King or Parent,
 ems a is a personal Incapacity for the Time, but no
 stand- ing,

Forfeiture of their Authority. When *Nebuchadnezzar's* Reason return'd to him, his Lords and Counsellors sought to him again, and he was confirm'd in his Kingdom. The Tying my Father in his Bed in a Fever, comes under no Notion of Resistance, it is helping and serving him. I see no use your Resistance-Men can make of this, but to have the Liberty to call their King or their Father Mad when they think fit, and so get loose from their Authority. But to all sober Men these are the Mad-Men.

Thus, I hope, I have sufficiently answered your Reasons given to make Kings accomptable to the People, and to your Mob-Notion of the People being the Original of Government, I Answer, That no Man having power over his own Life, cou'd not transferr it to another; and therefore, that the Power of Life and Death cou'd not be conveyed to the Magistrate from the People.

Wh. It is of small importance to this Question, whether a Man have Power over his own Life, or not, if so be he appears to have it, in some particular Cases over the Life of another.

Sch. But pray, what are these particular Cases?

Wh. When a Man assaults my Life, and I take his in my own Defence, if I cannot save my self otherways.

Sch. Is this having any Power or Authority to dispose of his Life as I think fit, or to Vote it away at my Pleasure? If so, then he has the same Power over my Life, and may take it even by way of Prevention, tho' I do not meddle with him: If he says, he's afraid I should fall upon him, for he is Judge of his own Fears, this is *Hobb's* his State of Nature, and shews all Mankind standing, every
Man

Man with his Dagger at his Neighbours Throat, by way of Self-defence! But even in this Case, here is no Authority among any or all of these, I do not mean that a Man has not a physical Power over his own Life and cannot kill himself, no surely, but that if he does, he commits a Sin, because God has not given him Authority so to do.

Now, I say, that none has, or can have any Power or Authority but what is given him by some other, except God alone, who is the sole Fountain of all Power and Authority on Earth as well as in Heaven. And therefore, that God not having given Man Power over his own Life, nor in his Natural State over the Life of any other Man; consequently the Power of Life and Death (which is necessary in all Government) cou'd never come from the Gift or Grant of the People in their Natural State. But that the positive Institution of God is necessary to found Government, and invest Magistrates with the Power of Life and Death, and that without this, no Obligation of Conscience can be laid upon any Man to submit to any Government whatsoever; for no Man can so dispose of his Natural Right, but that he may resume it again when he sees it reasonable and necessary for his own Preservation, of which he only himself is Judge, and therefore that Government could never be founded upon this imaginary and independent State of Nature, nor cou'd subsist if it were so. But that we must search up to the Original and first Institution of Government by God himself, and there only shall we find the Authority of Government, and the Obligation upon our Conscience of submitting to it, as to the Ordinance of God, and as to his

Au-

Authority delegated to Men, so that they who Resist, Resist not Men, but God.

Wh. But put the Case, that a private Man shou'd of his own Head kill even a Malefactor, supposing no fixed Civil Government, I think this so far from being Murder, that he wou'd be a publick Benefactor, who shou'd kill a publick Enemy.

Sch. And another may think the Malefactor an honest Man than him who kill'd him, and for the same Reason may knock the Executioner on th' Head; and another on the Executioners side run the other Zealot through, and so on to the end of the Chapter, all Zealots, and all murdering one another for the publick Good, of which every one is as much Judge as another.

Wh. But put the Case, that even in a settled Government, a violent and sudden Attack be made upon a Man's Life and those of his Family, in which an Appeal cannot be made soon enough to the Magistrate, they have a natural Right to kill the Attempters.

Sch. Why so? Because the Attempters had no Right over them. What has this to do with the resisting lawful Magistrates? But 2^{dly}, This natural Right to resist Robbers and cut Throats, comes not to me from any other Man, by his Grant or Concession, else it were not Natural to me; and since no Man can give to another more than he has himself, consequently all that (by this Argument) can be transferred to Magistrates from the People, is only to resist violent and sudden Attempts (so sudden by the Way, as that the Magistrate cannot be appealed to:) But what is this to the trying of Causes and hearing Appeals

in

in cold Blood? Which is the proper Work of Magistrates, and requires a settled Authority, which only can be by Commission from some who have Authority to give such a Commission, and that can be given by none who have not a natural Right over the Lives of all that are made subject to such an Authority, and that is none but God; therefore his Authority must be shewed, and the Deputation of it from these to whom he gave it to others under them. For the Case of Self-defence against those who have no Authority at all, as I have before shewed; or if it did need Authority, it has the Authority of all the Governments in the World, because all do allow it, but none will allow a private Man to judge, condemn, and execute a Malefactor, for that wou'd be to dissolve all Government; and therefore I conclude, that the Argument against your popular Scheme, taken from a private Man's not having Power and Authority to kill a Malefactor, shews invincibly that this Authority comes not from Nature, or by the Authority of the People, who have no such Authority themselves. If they have it from Nature, then every Man has it as well as they, and so needs none of their Authority. And if they pretend to it by particular Commission from God, let them shew it, and the Dispute will soon be at an end.

Wh. But still I cannot away with the Thought of absolute Subjection, and that he shou'd be called *the Minister of God*, who acts contrary to his Will, as if God gave a Commission to any to break his Commandments. This is most absurd, that Men shou'd be tyed to Obedience upon the Notion of *Divine Right* in the Magistrate, at least

to.

to *Non-Resistance*, when he openly transgresses the Law of God, and turns that Power given him for the Preservation of the Society, manifestly to its Ruin and Destruction. To remedy all which, I think it is better consulted for the publick Good, that the Magistrate should have no Pretence to *Divine Right*, but in so far as that may be supposed in the Election of the People, and that the People should have the Liberty of Resistance, and even to depose and condemn the Magistrate when he acts contrary to the Ends of his Institution, and to choose another when they think it most beneficial for the Good of the Community, and this wou'd make the Magistrate more careful in his Administration of Justice, and afford the Subject better Remedy against any unjust Sentence of his.

Sch. The difference then betwixt your Scheme of Government and mine, will be easily understood by the difference betwixt a Judge vested with Authority, by a Power superior to me; to which my Consent is not asked; nor would it signify any thing if I refus'd it: And an Arbitrator chosen by both Parties, who has no Authority but what is given him by our Consent, and against whose unjust Sentence we have a proper Remedy; for that he is not Absolute and Arbitrary, nor can enforce his Sentence by Imprisonment or other Punishment for contempt of his Authority, &c. I think the Case is fairly put, and with all the Advantages to your Hypothesis that you your self can put it. Now by the Judge, I mean the Magistrate vested with divine Authority, against whom therefore all Resistance is a Sin. And by the Arbitrator I mean the Magistrate

strate as chosen by the People, accountable to them, and deposible by them; so that the Magistrates are the Arbitrators, but the People the Umpire. The last Appeal is to them in the one Case, and to the King in the other. In this State of Things, you and I have a Sute depending for all we have in the World, or you prefer a capital Accusation against me, or I against you; and suppose the Arbitrator gives his Decreet or Sentence against me. I will take the hard Part upon my self, and make my Defence in your Words, and upon your Principles, thus, and say to the Arbitrator, Sir, I will not stand to your Decreet, nor submit to your Sentence for these Reasons, 1. Because you have no Authority over me, but what I gave you, and no Man can suppose that ever I did intend to ruin and destroy my self by choosing you for my Arbitrator. No, it was to do me Justice, and for Self-Preservation against the unjust Attempts of this Clergy-man upon me. But you have done quite otherwise, and instead of protecting me, for which End I chose you, you have manifestly done me injustice, and oppress'd me; therefore the same Self-preservation which made me choose you for my Arbitrator, obliges me now to re-call my Consent, and I will make a new Choice. Any Man may be mistaken in his Choice, and no rash or indiscreet Act can take away the natural Right of Self-Preservation, nor must any surprise, debar a Man from the Liberty of altering his Opinion upon better Information, that would be to take away the use of Reason from us. And to submit our selves blindfold to to the meer arbitrary, absolute, and despotical

Will of another, tho' never so apparently unjust and tyrannical.

2. Besides, Sir, you were a very just honest Man when I chose you for my Arbitrator, at least I thought so. But since you have got into Power, you are quite altered, I can prove it; you have taken Bribes, and make not the Law your Rule, but Govern by your meer arbitrary Will and Pleasure, and you have many evil Counsellors too, who for their own Ends, and to enrich themselves, persuade and lead you to do many oppressive Things to the hurt of the Community, for whose Good you were chosen. Your very Servants tyrannize over us, and we cannot come at you without putting Money in their Pockets, and who give most are best heard. These are grievous Things, and quite different from the Ends of your Constitution, and therefore since you have altered I may alter too, and recall my Consent, which I hereby do, and renounce you from being any longer an Arbitrator for me. 3. I appeal from your unjust Decree and Sentence to the Umpire, that is, the People, no Man can deny me this; and if you Over-rule me here, you are a Traitor, &c. Rebel against the People, by whose Authority you Govern, and you refuse to be accountable to them, and therefore have forfeited your Commission, and you are no longer Superior to me than while you continue in the due Execution of the Office you are called to, and in all Cases where the Danger is imminent, Violence is to be repelled with Violence, and the same Behaviour which is allowed in the Case of Equals.

Now, Sir, judge for your self, is not this the End of your Scheme of Government? Can you put

put it any otherwife? If you allow of Appeals to the People, that is, to every Body, is not this direct Anarchy? And if you allow it not, then your Arbitrator is as absolute as my Judge. If the last Resort be in the King, there is an end of Controversy one way or other; and tho' an unjust Decree may be given in some Cases, yet in the Main, it is for the Good and Benefit of the Community, and preserves them in Peace and Order: But if the last Resort be in the People, there is no end of Controversy at all, but endless and unremediable Confusion; and you not only put all Mankind upon the Level at the beginning, but you continue them so, and make it impossible for them ever to be otherwise. For he to whom the last Appeal lyes, may always supersede the Sentence, or stop the Proceedings of all Inferiours, call them either Judges or Arbitrators; so that you have gained nothing by divesting the Magistrate of *Divine Right*, for without a last Resort there can be no Government: If this be in the People, there is still no Government, and if you stop short of all the People, then where ever it rests, there it is Absolute, unaccountable, &c. and had we not as good have this with *Divine Right*, and be entitul'd to the Protection of God, who tells, *that the Heart of the King is in his Hand*; as to have the same Absoluteness without any Right at all, and in Opposition to the Ordinance of God, and liable to his Judgments, for our Self-will, and going out of his Way to find By-paths of our own; wherein he often permits us to taste our Folly; in Mercy if we Repent, and to our Destruction if we persist.

I have used more Words to you, than I would to another Man, to make this exceeding plain; but, if still you cannot apprehend it, yet I hope

every other Man in *England* will, and if I be not right, pray shew where you place the last Resort; and if that be not absolute and unaccountable, this is a short Issue; and if you cannot give a direct Answer to it, it shews you are bewildered, and have been dancing all this while in the Clouds.

Wh. I will take some Time to think upon it, and I doubt not to find an Answer.

Sch. Well, seeing I have run you out of Breath, and over-thrown all the Arguments you have brought to support your popular Scheme, I will leave you to gather fresh Strength, and if you please to meet me at this same Place to Morrow at Five a Clock, I shall be glad to hear what you have to say further in your own Defence, and so I bid you Good-night.

Wh. I shall be sure to wait on you, and be better prepared, adieu.

P A R T II.

Sch. **I** Am glad to see you here before me, and I hope before we part, to bring you back from the inconsistent *Whiggish Principles* about Government, which you have unhappily imbibed, to the sound and Orthodox *Christian Principles of the Church of England*: I was not a little glad of my Success with you last Night, you frightened me at first with a large Catalogue of *Whig-Writers*, to which, and the Practice of our Forefathers, you re-

referred me; but I told you I had considered all their Arguments, and remained unmoveable. The Reason and Understanding of a Man that gives himself Liberty to think and consider Things impartially, is not so easily imposed upon, as you may imagin. I own indeed, you have given good Proof of your Pains and Study to be thoroughly informed of all that has been said on the *Whigs* side, and so very accurately summ'd up all their Arguments, that I believe there remains very little to be said further, and I am sure nothing of Moment.

Wh. Not so little as you imagine, which you shall see anon.

I told you, that to understand political Power aright, and derive it from its Original, we must consider what State all Men are naturally in, and that is a *State of perfect Freedom*, and a State also of *Equality*, &c. as I describ'd at large before. Now that there was, and still is such a State in every Age, I prove from Instances of People in the uncivilized Parts of the World, without any established Civil Government; and if ever Government came to be rightfully settled among them, it must be by voluntary Compact and Agreement; therefore, Government which succeeds to this natural State, must necessarily flow from the People.

Sch. That ever there was such an independent State of Nature as you contend for, can no more be proven, than that such a State actually now is at this Day in any Part of the habitable World, as you affirm, for I am not to take bare Affirmations for Proof. And pray, can you name any of these Wildnesses or uncivilized Parts, whether other People's Travels have not carried them? We found

found Government among the barbarous *Indians* in *America*, and they had great Kings among them, who defended their Country against the *Spaniards*, and where we Trade in *Guinea* in *Africa* they have Kings, who sell us the *Blacks* they take in War from each other. The very *Hottentotes* at the *Cape of Good-Hope* have Government among them, and these are the wildest in the World; so that you must go to some of your wildernesses about the Center to find your independent State, for it is not upon the Face of the Earth, but have a care that some of your Acquaintances in that Country has not misinformed you, for Hell it self could not subsist without Government, and if its Kingdom were divided against it self could not stand.

But since you are so fond of these Savages, you shall have them, and without Fathers and Mothers too if you will. For the paternal is a civil Power, and Supreme where there is none above it. And let us suppose that they never had any Government among them since the Flood, and in that Case I am of Opinion that they never would find out Government of themselves; and my Reason is, because they have not done it all this time. How then should we think they would light upon it now? And if we suppose all Mankind even to have been in that State, I believe they would have so remained to this Day, and for the same Reason: But I am persuaded that Government was not the Thought or Invention of any Man, more than Language, but the Institution of God himself, and we had still been all Savages as well as Dumb, if we had been so created: And God did not create Men in Multitudes and independent of each other, like the Beasts,

Beasts, Fish and Fowl, but all to be deduced from one, with a Particular Designation of Men for Government; and as God did put the Fear of Man upon the Birds, Beasts, &c. when he gave to Man the Dominion over them, without which it had been impossible for Man to have govern'd them; So likewise from the Beginning God did imprint in Men another Reverence towards their Governours, without which, whole Nations could never have been brought to submit all to one Man. And as God sometimes takes off this Fear from some wild Beasts, and lets them loose upon Men for their Punishment; so God in like manner, when he designs to Scourge a Nation, lets them work themselves out of that Fear and Regard to their Princes and Governors, which he first planted in their Nature, as the Cement of the civil Society, and without this Mankind would be as incapable of Government as the brute Beasts, or as you suppose these Savages are just now, and no less Power than what reduc'd the *Chaos*, could bring a World of your supposed Savages to agree of themselves upon any sort of Government whatsoever, or quietly to submit to it, if settled. No Man would think himself bound to submit to his own Destruction, for any Promise or Consent he had given towards his own Preservation: No, I'll submit to Government while it is for my Preservation, and for the same Reason resist when it is for my Destruction, for Self-preservation is the unalterable Law; and it would be Nonsense in the Natural State to bid me Die for the Good of others: No, let others Die for my Good. What is the Publick to me further than I am concern'd in it? Put it to the Vote among your Savages, and

and see whether this would not carry it? How many such Savages have we in *England*? And could Government ever be settled among these? The *Whigs* and all the independent-State-Men are such Savages, and bring their Arguments from them; Here I'll shew it. Come then, let you and I try our Hands with one of your Savages, or State of Nature-Men. You tell him he should submit to be hang'd for Self-preservation; and because he has transferred the Right he had over his own Life to Magistrates of his own choosing. Now let him speak for himself.

Sav. It was Self-preservation made me consent to that, and if that turns against my Self-preservation, I am obliged to retract my Consent.

Wh. But your being Hang'd is Self-preservation, being for the Good of Others.

Sav. Is that my Preservation? By *Self*, I find you mean only your own self and not my self. Then, good Sir, be pleased to hang your self, it would be much to the Preservation of my self; for I see you begin to look Angry at the Proposal, and if you will not do it, I must ---- for Self-preservation, lest you serve me so, and prefer your self to my self.

Wh. But your Promise and Consent, Mr. *Savage*, when you chose this Government, and promised to submit to it, ---- Is not an honest Man tyed to his Word?

Sav. Not, if that would tie him to the Gallows. He never meant it so, and you know the Meaning is the Thing. Pray, what did you mean when you took Oaths to contrary Governments?

Wh. To

Wh. To be true to both ----- while they were true to me, that is, my Interest, and that is always the publick Good.

Sav. And will you tye a *Heathen Savage* to his Promise, more than you *Christians* are to your Oaths? And if the one cannot fix Government, why should the other? How then will you establish Government upon the Consent of the People? Give me as much Latitude, and the same Distinctions you use as to Oaths, and I'll undertake to solve all the Promises in the World. Nay, I'll subscribe your Creed, and be a good *Heathen Savage* still! I'll abjure my own No-Religion, and yet be ne'er the nearer yours; so that if you would have Faith and Truth kept among Men, you must all turn *Heathen Savages*.

Wh. You grow unmannerly. ----- I'll turn you to this *Oxford Scholar*, See what he can say to you. He understands the Laws better than I do.

Sav. Come Mr. *Scholar*, can you prove to me, that to consent to be hang'd is Self-preservation?

Sch. Yes I can, if I had first perswaded you to be a *Christian*.

Sav. Well, let me be a *Christian* for Discourse sake. Now, go on.

Sch. Would not you be content to be Hang'd, rather than be Damn'd?

Sav. Yes surely, and if you can shew me that this is the Case, it will be Self-preservation indeed, rather to lose my Life in this World, than for ever.

D

Sch. The

Sch. The Christian Doctrine is, that Government is the Institution of God, and that all lawful Governours are vested with his Authority; and therefore that to resist them, is to resist the Ordinance of God, and that they who resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.

Sav. This is Sense and good Argument upon the Christian Scheme, and shews us the Original of Government, and the Obligation to it, that it is for Conscience sake, and not only for fear of temporal Punishment; and it likewise rids us out of that Chaos of the suppos'd independent State of Nature, and Government rising from the Election of the People, which if it had been a natural Thing, surely we *Savages* should have thought of it in so many hundred Years. No Man need to be taught what Nature dictates.

And now, Sir, I return to you, and I would have you to consider, that there is no Authority but what is derived from God, it would be to set up another God, to suppose any other independent Authority; and this Matter is of that importance, that the Decision of all civil Causes whatsoever, is only by Authority. It is not Law or Justice, or Reason, ever yet decided any such Cause, or ever can. These indeed are Rules by which a Judge ought to go, but if he does not, his Decree stands good till revers'd by a higher Authority; so that Authority still is the whole, and all Authority is dependent and subject to those who gave it; therefore it is impossible for any to give Authority over himself, because such Authority must be for ever subject to him, and consequently is no Authority over him. Hence the Folly appears of the People's making Judges
over

over themselves, while they still remain Judges over these Judges; and their giving a Magistrate Power to do Justice, while he is accountable to them for his Administration, and they have Authority to reverse his Sentence, and say, *His Power is limited to do every thing for their Good*; or else, *that it is void and not to be obeyed*, is just as if I should make a Man my Arbitrator in a Cause, but tie him up to give it on my Side, otherwise that his Decree should have no effect. Could any Man be my Judge or Arbitrator, if I were Judge over him? Or could any Man be a Judge if he had not Power to give the Cause either way, on the unjust as well as the just side? And does not the King's Commission bear him out in this, while it allows of no Remedy but by Appeal to an higher Authority; yet we say not that the King gives him Commission to do Injustice, neither that he is not a lawful Judge, even when he pronounces an unjust Decree; for he must have that Power, else he could not be a Judge at all; yet it is not the King's Will that he should do any Unjustice, and when he does so, he goes against the King's Will, but still acts by the King's Commission, and has his Authority for what he does, which defends him from all Violence in the execution of his Office. And tho' he may do Things which deserve the forfeiture of his Office, yet he forfeits only to the King, and none can take his Commission from him, but he who gave it him, and till his Commission be taken from him, he is still Judge, and his Authority indisputable; so of a General, or any other put in Authority under the King. I lay this down so plainly, that you may see the Fallacy of that Argument, so much

urg'd by the *Whigs*, viz. That Evil doing is not agreeable to the Will of God, and that God gives no Man a Commission to do Evil: Therefore, that when a King does Evil, he ceases to be the Minister of God, and so ought to be resisted as a Robber or Cut-Throat, for that in so doing he has no Commission from God. To which the Answer is in short from what I have said, That the Male-administration is from himself, and not from God, but that this does not void his Commission, which is still from God; and that the Resistance of it, notwithstanding his Male-administration, is a resisting the Ordinance of God, as much as a Mutiny against a General, or shooting a Judge upon the Bench for their Male-administrations, would be a resisting the King from whom they had their Commissions, and as taking upon me to Correct and Punish the Male-administration of the King's Officers, and to take their Commissions from them, would be to usurp the King's Authority, and so would be the highest Treason against the King, it being in effect a setting up my self to be King: So to punish Kings, and take their Commission from them, is no less than aspiring to be God, and to take the Government out of his Hands.

Wh. But you mention that the Paternal is a Civil Power, and Supreme Where there is none above it, but you do not prove it; and till you prove that *Adam* and his Descendants had such a Power, your Foundation of Government falls to the Ground; for I think there is a great difference betwixt Paternal Authority and Civil Government, which you seem to think are all one, without any manner of Difference. Pray, how do you make it out?

Sch. You

Sch. You have touched an Argument much hammered on by the *Whigs*, but with as little Success as the rest, and as easily answered.

That the Paternal is Civil Authority, Supreme and Absolute (where there is no superior Civil Power to controul it) as to Life and Death, Liberty and Property, and every thing else, we have the concurrent Testimony of Holy Scripture, and other Histories, as in the Case of *Abraham's* sacrificing his Son, of *Judah* condemning his Daughter to Death, of *Reuben* pauning the Lives of his Sons for the Safe-guard of *Benajmin*, *Lot* exposing his Daughters to save his Guests, in *Jephthah* sacrificing his Daughters, &c. *Bodin* says, That every Pater Familias had full Authority in all civil Causes even to Life and Death, and (*de Repub. Lib. i. C. 4.*) thinks it an Error in the latter civil Governments to have abridged this absolute Authority of every Father in his own Family, as encouraging the Disobedience of Children, &c. which (says he) was not taken away till *Constantine the Great*. And he quotes a Speech of *Seneca* to *Nero*, telling him there had been more Parricides during the Government of his Father, than from the first building of *Rome* to that Time, which was occasioned by the enervating of the fatherly Authority, which had all along before prevailed, and that no more equal Judge could be supposed over Children than their own Father, whose Authority was founded in the Laws of God and Nature.

Aristotle (*Polit. Lib. i. C. 1. & 2. &c.*) calls the Pater Familias The King of the Family, with full Power over his Wife as well as Children and Servant. He says, the Wife was reckoned as a Servant, contrary to *Mr. Lock*, who would have the Wife

Wife of equal Authority with the Husband, because it is said, *honour Father and Mother*) and where the Family was large he calls it a City. He says, *There is no difference betwixt a large Family and a little City, where many Families were under one ;* And he says, *That the Government was perfectly Monarchial, and that it was so from the beginning in all Cities and Countries in the World before the Grecian Commonwealths were set up, and that the Succession of the Government was in the Primogeniture.* And Cicero says, (*De Legib. lib. 3.*) *Omnes antiquae gentes regibus quondam paruerunt,* That all the antient Nations were once under Kings : And Justine begins his History with these Words, *Principio rerum, gentium nationumque imperia penes reges erant,* That in the beginning of Things, the Government of People and Nations was in Kings. This was the fatherly Authority of which Quintilian says (*Declam. 6.*) *Pater jussit hoc nomen omni Lege majus est. Jus nobis vita necisque concessum est,* That the Command of the Father is above all Laws, and extends to Life and Death.

And Cesar says (*de Bell. Gall. lib. 6.*) *Viri in uxores, sicuti in liberos, vita necisque habent potestatem,* That Men had Power of Life and Death over their Wives, as well as their Children. Thus Adam was both Father and King of all the World, and therefore Civil Government was from the very Beginning. But after the Death of Adam, this Civil Government descended to his eldest Son, and the Rule and Dominion over Abel (tho' he was the more righteous Man) was given to Cain his elder Brother, as it is plain, *Gen. 4. 7.* and thus it was till the Flood, none but the eldest of the eldest of the Patriarchs being named in the Genealogy, *Gen. 5.* The rest are past over under the

the general Names of Sons and Daughters. After the Flood then once again one Man (*Noah*) was Father and King of all the Earth; and when after this, God thought fit to alter the Method of Universal Monarchy, and to divide the World into Seventy Independent Nations, and set a Ruler over every one of them, all of whose Names are set down, *Gen. 10.* in each of these Kingdoms (the Names of some of which remain to this Day, as of *Babylon*, of *Assyria* from *Assur*, &c.) the Government descended by Primogeniture, which was the Rule of all the Earth, and still is in most Places to this Time So that the first Man that was born, was born under Civil Government, and so of all that ever were born since. Now, here is the true Foundation of Government, which together with the Positive Institution of God, is both plain and intelligible, and I hope sufficiently proven: Where then shall we find your independent State? And do you shew the Time when there was no Civil Government in the World, for till you can shew that, you can make no other Beginning of it than I have done.

Wh. I find you are very good at defending your Principles, but that shall not make me change till I be better advised, for it is safest for a Man to consult his Interest in all Matters of Government, providing he keep firm to the Protestant Interest and Religion. Your Scheme puts too great a Restraint upon a Man's Liberty. Pray, tell me why the general Declaration of *St. Paul* against Resistance, should be taken without Limitation, when there are other general Commands in Scripture, which admit of Limitation?

Seb. I

Sch. I Answer, God may put Limitations to his own general Commands, and if you had descended to any Instance, I believe I could have shewed it you. It is a general Command, *Thou shalt not Kill*, but in other Places the Magistrate is excepted and commanded to Kill. Again, *whom God hath joined* (speaking of Man and Wife) *no Man should put assunder*, yet *Divorce* is allowed in particular Cases. If you can shew the like Exception from the general Prohibition against resisting the higher Powers. We will allow it, but you must not put Limitations of your own Head to the general Commands of God; He has put a Limitation to the Sixth Command, will you therefore to the Seventh, and shew in what Cases that may be dispensed with.

Again, when Obedience is enjoined to any Man, or Order of Men, it is to be understood saving the Obedience due to their Superiors Paramount. Thus Children are commanded to obey their Parents in all Things; but this is still in Subordination to the King and our Superiors, both in Church and State, to whom our Parents themselves owe their Obedience; but neither of these Cases will come up to your Point of Resistance against the higher Powers, nor any Case I believe you can put.

Wh. But I wonder how it can possibly be for the Good of the People, to suffer themselves and their Posterity to be made miserable at the Will of the supreme Governour, when they see they can save themselves if they will, and establish a better State of Things.

Sch. You should say, you wonder you cannot fall upon any Exception in Holy Scripture from the
the

the general Prohibition against Resistance, but your Wonder may cease when I can assure you there is none. As also tell you, that the People never yet saw, or ever will see, how they can save themselves by Resistance. No, it always proves their Ruin, and instead of a better State of Things, it involves them in Blood and vast Expences, far more than their patient Submission would have done; therefore God saw it for their Good to take the Arms of Resistance out of their Hands, with which they always destroy themselves.

Wh. But, Sir, the Revolution was founded upon Resistance, and upon your Principles, it was a Guilt not to be washed out in many Years, till grievously repented of, and to be visited in some terrible manner upon late Posterity, as some think it hath upon our selves, by a long and expensive War, &c.

Sch. I see you chime in here with *Observatours*, *Reviews*, and other *Mob-Writers*, who blacken the Revolution, by putting it upon Resistance, and make it as odious as the 30th of January; and as *De Foe* says, p. 20, 21. of his Preface to his Satyr against *Jure Divino*, *That the dry Martyrdom of King James II. was much greater than the wet Martyrdom of his Father King Charles I.* in defence of his *Review of December 18. 1705. Num. 123. p. 489.* You see I have found out who has made you believe that the Revolution was founded upon Resistance. And are you really of his Opinion, That there was nothing of Anarchy or Confusion in the Government in the Year 1659? And that the Restauration of the Church, the King and Royal Family the next Year 1660, was the beginning of Tyranny, whence he Dates it, and makes up just the 28

E

Years

Years of its Reign, which he reckons from that Time to the Revolution? And do you think the former 22 Years, from 1638, when the Covenant was set up, and Liberty and Property began to be asserted in *Scotland* by the *Whig* Kirk-men there, in a rebellious and tumultuous Assembly at *Glasgow*, which they called *General*, to the Year 1660? Do you think these were blessed Times? If so, your blessed Times are very chargeable Things, for except since the Year 1688, *England* never saw so much of her Blood and Money poured out as in those 20 Years, of Liberty and Property, from 1640, to 1660, more than in the Reigns of all her Kings (Tyrants as they were) for about 500 Years before, from *William* the Conqueror, put all together! And *England* never knew since it was *England*, such a Time, for Peace, Plenty, flourishing of Trade, and all worldly Blessings as in those 28 Years of Tyranny *DeFoe* has reckoned, from 1660 to 1688, but all that was well parted with, and all that which followed well bestowed to purchase a Reformation of Manners and Zeal to Religion, which has ensued; and the Liberty to part freely with our Money, which some have made a Property of! And to have all this perpetuated and secured to our Posterity, is worth Millions of Millions, and Oceans of Blood! And surely it will be the better for us, the less we have of the *Root of all Evil*, and when that is quite gone, we shall then see blessed Times! But that you may have a better Opinion of the Revolution, I refer you to the Prince of *Orange* his Declarations about his coming over, where he utterly disowns it to be by way of Conquest or Resistance to the King or the Kingdom, but only to have Things settled

settled according to Law, and particularly that the Birth of the Prince of *Wales* should be examined in Parliament, that no Detriment should come to the Succession of his Wife the Princess: And the Convention did not go upon the Foot of Resistance, or taking Arms against the King, and deposing him by Force, but upon Abdication; which they explained to be a free and voluntary renouncing of the Crown, as it is at large in the Debates of the *Convention* which are printed. And further, to put it upon the Foot of Resistance, is to make it go contrary, not only to the received Doctrine of the Church of *England*, but to the known Laws of the Land, which most expressly condemn all Coercion upon the Crown, either in Lords, Commons or People, or any other Person whatsoever. See the Statute, 12. *Car. 2. C. 30.*

Wh. Sir, you are very pragmatick, and you are mightily puffed up with that slavish Doctrine of *Non-Resistance*, but as long as you *Tories* preach it up, so long I may assure you, there will be a Spirit in some others to take what care they can that the Foundation shall not be undermined, to the manifest Prejudice of the Establishment; nor the Doctrine of *Servitude* imposed upon whole Nations to the Scandal of the Church, and the Disgrace of Christianity.

Sch. Sir, you begin to be Angry, but pray, whether has greater Scandal come to the Church, or Disgrace to Christianity, by her Resistance or Non-Resistance? Search your Histories and see, give us one Instance. The Church was Glorious in the old Times of Persecution for Her *Non-resistance*, even when She was able to have taken up the Arms of Resistance in Defence of Christianity;

against wicked, and worse than *Papish* Princes : Our Martyrs in the Dayes of Queen *Mary*, preached the Doctrine of *Non-resistance* at the Stake, and thought it not lawful to take Arms against Her Majesty in behalf of the Princess *Elizabeth*, the only Protestant left in the Royal Line, whose Birth was declared illegitimate, and she debarred from the Succession by Act of Parliament : And for further Security was put in the *Tower* under the Sentence of Death, and a Warrant was once signed for her Execution. But see how God rewarded the *Non-resistance* of her *Protestant Subjects*, who put their Trust in Him, and would not attempt to rescue themselves, their Country or Religion, which was abolished by Act of Parliament, and never like to revive, all the Heirs of the Crown (except the condemned Princess) being *Papists* ; yet in all this Distress, the *Protestants* then thought it not lawful to resist the Ordinance of God, or to serve Him, by the Breach of his Commandments, and to save Religion by Rebellion ; when in this last Extremity God shewed himself, took away Queen *Mary* by Natural Death, not by the Resistance of her injured Subjects, and brought the *Protestant* Princess from the Scaffold to the Throne, and gave her 44 Years Possession of it, to the Establishment of our Religion, then at the last Gaspe in *England*. What think you Sir, if they had run the hazard of Resistance, would it likely have done so well as this which you see God had provided for them ? And is not their Non-Resistance thought Glorious by all good Men to this Day, and the Deliverance of God most wonderful to those who by patient submitting in Well-doing, trusted wholly to his Goodness ? And this Turn
was

was cheap too, it cost them not one drop of Blood, nor one penny of Money, and they overcame as *Christ* their *Lord* did, the Apostles and primitive Christians, by Non-resistance and Sufferings. And what Disgrace has this brought to Christianity?

But what Disgrace has not been brought upon it, to the Scandal of *Jews, Turks and Pagans*, by the Resistance of your Fore-fathers, Sir, the Saints of 41, who perpetrated all the Villanies in the World, and sanctified with the Name of *Christ* their Treachery, Peajury, Sacrilege, Rebellion, the Murder of their King, and drenching the Nations in their own Blood, with all Rapine and Violence upon their Fellow Subjects; and the Plunder and demolishing of Churches, and trampling under Foot all things Sacred to the Glory of God, and Support of the Christian Religion! This the Church and Christianity has got by the Doctrine of *Resistance*! Now, Sir, shew your Parts, and tell what Disgrace has ever come to them by their *Non-resistance*.

Wh. Now, Sir, you talk extravagantly, for can ever a King expect any other than whenever he attempts to ruin the Constitution, suspends the Laws, and invades Property, overturns Religion, brings in *Popery*, Arbitrary Power and Tyranny (which was the Case of King *Charles I.* and King *James II.*) they will never be obeyed, the People ought to oppose such Oppression; and if they do not, 'tis for want of Power, not for want of Will.

Sch. I see you are running into your Wildness again, and what you say, amounts only to this, I met a Man, and I suspect he has some Design upon me to take away my Life or Goods, and I think it my Interest and Duty to secure my self, and

and if I can by any means to take away his Life by way of Prevention, lest he take away mine. Will this justify Resistance?

Wh. But, Sir, you cannot but know, and we are assured by Authority (12. Car. 2. C. 30) that the Murder of King *Char. I.* was the Contrivance and Work of a few Miscreants (as that Statute calls them) against the general Bent of the Nation; whereas the Resistance practised against King *James II.* was the Contrivance and Work of all Ranks and Orders of Men, against the Bent but of a very few.

Sch. You think I have been too severe against the Murderers of King *Ch. I.* and would only have the Blame to ly on a few. But how come you to bring in the Revolution, for I have answered that sufficiently before. But to the first I Reply, That a good Cause may be hurt by a bad Defence; and the Defence you make here is altogether bad, it has not a Word of Truth in it: For the Murder of the King was to all appearance, as much by the general Bent of the Nation, as the Revolution it self, for not one appeared to give his *Negative*. It is true, they were but a few Miscreants in comparison of all the honest and loyal Men of the Nation; if they durst have spoken their Minds, or could have come together, but they were kept under by these Miscreants with a standing Force, who took to themselves the Name of all the People of *England*; and in their Name did Try and Condemn their King; their damnable Conventicle called itself a Parliament, and asserted their Authority as high as ever Parliament did. They were owned and treated with Abroad, obeyed and recognized at Home; nor was there one in the Nation

Nation durst dispute their Authority, but at the peril of his Head. They made Men swear to them too, and the Nonjurors were decimated, sequestered, imprisoned, banished, hanged, &c. They also attainted and abjur'd the King, and the whole Royal Family: There was a through Settlement, the King had not one Fort or Ship, or Men to appear for him, and they were in quiet Possession several Years, and quoted Scripture and Law, and Precedents, and Providence too for their Usurpation; and their being called *Miscreants* in that Act of Parliament, was not for their want of Success, or Numbers, or Settlement, but because they openly and barefacedly set up the Doctrine of *Resistance* and the Eversion of Kings, which that Statute did for ever Damne, and therefore makes you as much a *Miscreant* as any of these Regicides; and whoever maintains the Power of the People and the Resistance of Kings, are guilty of the Blood of that King.

And how could the general bent of the People better appear than by those who conquered the Others? There was nothing of the Bent on the other side appeared, but in a few Cavalier Pamphlets, which now and then stole out, and were hunted, and these indeed kept Life in the Cause, and at last prevailed, having Truth on their Side, and a Superiority of Wit above the dull Round Heads; which in a little Time carried the People from them, when their own Miseries opened their Eyes to see their true Interest, and so made way for the Happy Restoration; but in all that Time, tho' many were persuaded by what was wrote on the King's side, yet none durst own it; so that
the

the Bent did noways appear, and you, Sir, can make no Advantage of it to your Cause.

Wh. But still I expect a further Answer to the Resistance practised against King *James II.* for the same was done by some of my Lords the Bishops, to their immortal Honour, with a Zeal beyond what is common. Thus those of the highest, as well as holiest Rank, and of the best Quality, invited over a Prince with armed Men to Awe their legal King, and force him into a Compliance, and the Arms of Resistance landed upon the Invitation.

Sch. I desire to know the Names of these Bishops (for why should you Rob them of their immortal Honour) with the Proof of their inviting over the Prince of *Orange*, and with Arms too? For it will be a Loss to Posterity; nay it is lost already, for few I meet with do believe a Word of it; for the Bishops themselves denied it to King *James*; and I have it from some that were near the Prince at that Time, and had Means of knowing, that there was no such Thing, and that there was no Invitation from any Bishop, tho' the Word *Spiritual* was put in the Declaration, *because* (said he) *it sounded well.*

But if there was an Invitation, was it to come with the Arms of Resistance, for there might be many other Reasons for the Coming over of the Prince of *Orange*, so nearly related to the King, and of Interest in *Holland*. And I know many at that Time, who did not believe he came for the Crown, for he declared against it. Now it is not lawful to tell a Lye, even to Ones own Advantager, of their Friends; Therefore, tho' it would be to the immortal Honour of any Bishop, who had invited

vited over the Prince of *Orange*, and more glorious still, if to come with the Arms of Resistance; yet I hope (notwithstanding of your great Veracity) you are obliged to give some Proof for your Allegation, under the pain of your being thought a *Gossip*. But may not you and I fairly argue this Point, without meddling so much with the Revolution? You seem to glory in overturning the very Foundation of it by placing it in Resistance; pray therefore, let us discuss it, and let us hear no more about it, and so give me leave to ask you a Question.

Wh. So it be not Captious or ensnaring.

Sch. Your self shall judge. Do you not found the King's Title upon the Disposition of the Crown, by the Convention, to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, &c.

Wh. That's a fair Question. And I answer it as frankly, that I do place it there and no where else.

Sch. And do you not think, that they who would overthrow the Foundation, and the Principles upon which the Revolution stands, and consequently the King's Title, do in effect destroy his Title.

Wh. Yes, most certainly, that is my Argument against you, that by the Principle of *Non-Resistance*, you do by necessary Consequence make His Majesty's Title only that of a successful Usurpation.

Sch. Did the Convention go upon the Foot of *Resistance*, or of *Abdication*.

Wh. That's ensnaring! I will not Answer you.

Sch. You must Answer it, or else you cannot tell what the Foundation or Principle of the Revolution is, nor consequently what Principle does contradict it.

F

Wh. I

Wh. I say the Revolution went upon the Foot of *Resistance*.

Sch. But did the Convention say so? You place the whole Authority and Title of the King upon the Convention, therefore you must take the Principle of the Convention, and if you go contrary to that, you overthrow his Majesty's Title, by destroying the Foundation of it.

Wh. I know not what they mean by *Abdication*.

Sch. It is told you in the Debates, [which are printed, that it was a free and voluntary renouncing of the Crown, and it is plain they went upon this Foot, on purpose to avoid that of *Resistance*, and they left the Laws against Coercion and Resistance standing in full Force, as they continue to this Day; as likewise the 30th of *January* and 29th of *May*, the Subject of which Solemnities are against Resistance.

Wh. I am not well pleased they left these preaching Days, and these Laws standing, but I care not how they explained *Abdication*, I am sure they meant *Resistance*.

Sch. How! Against their own express Words! This is as you deal with me, to make Meanings for me, let me say what I will to the contrary. It is neither more nor less than giving them the Lie, and telling them they were ----. And are you a Revolution-Man? Do you justify the *Convention*, and run just Counter to them?

Wh. I am sure the Prince of *Orange* came with the Arms of Resistance.

Sch. Did he tell you so? I am sure he told me the Contrary.

Wh. Told you! How now Mr. *Sauce-Box*, were you so familiar with his Highness?

Sch. He

Sch. He told you so too, and all the World in his Declarations, *That he came not with the Arms of Resistance, but only of Self-defence.*

Wh. And pray what's the Difference?

Sch. You see the Difference plain, for his self was defended, and there was no Resistance.

Wh. These are but small Matters in Politicks.

Sch. What! will you give his Highness the Lie too, and say he did not mean sincerely.

Wh. I will consider all these Things afterwards.

Sch. In the mean time you must give every Body leave to say, That hitherto you have gone in direct Opposition to his Highness, to the Convention, and have sapped the Foundation of the Revolution, These Blots stick till you have wip'd them off, therefore I tell you of these things; and so farewell to the Revolution say I, which you had better not have medled with in this Debate.

Wh. There is but one Case more, and then I have done with you, for I find I shall not be able to bring you over to our Side, and so I must even leave you to stand by your own Arguments, but I design to look to my Interest, and will be as much Proof against your Reasons, as you are against your own Interest, for the sake of a few cunningly devised Arguments. I put the Case thus, The Ruin of the Publick, and that plainly seen to be so, not Jealousies and Fears, nor any room for different Opinions, for any Suspence or Doubt in the Matter, but the Lives and Fortunes of the governed Body are to be submissively given up, and the King should ordain the Destruction of the whole Nation under him, in such a Case I think you will allow of Resistance. Now, I am

content not to allow of Resistance for my private Injuries done to particular Persons, for in these there is a last Resort in the Government, by whose Determination we ought to abide, even tho' Wrong or Injustice be done to us, and I grant there is no Appeal from what is called *The last Resort*, in Cases Criminal, or Causes of private Right; But there is no such Thing as such a *last Resort* in Government, at the Decree and Determination of which, the Lives and Fortunes of the governed Body are to be submissively given.

Sch. Now, when I have answered this, I think I shall have done with you too; for I find you are stubborn and hardned, and it's in vain to strive any more with you, for I see you will not be helped out of that Pit of *Whiggism*, into which you are fallen, tho' I was very willing to do it. Now to your last Case, I Reply distinctly, *First*, As to the plainness they saw it with their Eyes. *Secondly*, It affected the whole governed Body. And *Thirdly*, Not in a small Matter, but as to their very Lives, to kill them all. These were the Objections of *Dathan* and *Abiram*, and the whole Congregation against *Moses*; and the Case said to be thus plain, to which Place of Holy Write I refer you for Answer,

In the mean time, if there is no Difference betwixt private and publick Injuries in this Case, nor any way to be sure of the Ruin of the Publick till it is too late, then these nice Cases which you put are empty Sounds without any Meaning, and meer Amusements.

1. To what purpose else do you bring in a Case which never happned since the beginning of the World, and next to impossible that ever it should hap-

happen, viz. That any King or Government should order the Destruction of the whole governed Body.

2. If we stay till this utter Ruin is compleated, it will be too late to prevent it, for no Man complains after his Throat is Cut, therefore we must watch the beginning, the Steps and Tendencies towards this, here is room for all the Fears and Jealousies in the World, even to Looks and Thoughts.

3. The first attempts must be made upon some particular Persons, for a Nation cannot be destroyed all at once; and if we suffer One to be injured, it will be a Precedent for another, and another to the End of the Chapter, till Prescription become a Law, and we have no Remedy; so that your Rule not to Resist for private Injuries, will soon involve the Publick; for every particular is the whole. And what is the Publick but all the Privates? And you having tyed up every Private from Resistance, what then becomes of the Publick?

But this will appear clearer, if we look upon it in Fact, as on a Picture. I will give you but two Instances still fresh in Memory. The first is, that of *Ship-Money*, which began the Rebellion against King *Charles I.* all the Judges had given it under their Hands that it was Legal; yet Mr. *Hambden* did not think so: And tho' he was a very Rich Man of Five or Six Thousand a Year, and his Proportion of that Tax came but to Twenty Shillings, he spent four or five thousand Pounds, to defend that one Pound, not for love of the Money you may be sure, but for the Consequences; The Consequences! The Tendency of this! For at this Rate the King might take all the Money in the Kingdom, and was not he called a *Patriot* for this.

The

The other Instance is of the late King *James*, for the Case of Sir *Edward Hales*, argued at the *King's-Bench-Bar*, was but a private Case, and *Magdalen College* was but a private Case, and it was not for any Thing he did (that might easily have been born if that had been all) but the Consequences and the Tendency, to bring over all the Nation to *Popery*, St. *Jones's* Grid-Irons, and *Protestant* Bridles, these were of publick Concern and Notoriety! Nay Sir, the very Business of *Tarquin* and *Lucretia* was but a private Case, yet you see how soon it became publick. And since you have excluded Resistance in any private Case, I mean publick Resistance and Rebellion, for a private Injury, you and I may soon agree, for do but muzzle up your Resistance till the Government shall decree the universal Ruin and Destruction of the whole governed Body; and I dare say, it will be a great while before we shall fall out.

But then on the other hand, if you will not do this, but from Consequences and Tendencies, allow of publick Insurrections for private Injuries; and least the Case should be my own, then to what Purpose was this Distinction of yours betwixt publick and private? Was it only to amuse the poor Populace? Or have you deceiv'd your self in it? If so, I hope your Ingenuity will open your Eyes to see that there is nothing practicable towards Resistance in this Scheme you have set up, and that you had as good damn'd Resistance in all Cases, as have allowed it in that Case only, which never yet was the Case, nor is ever likely, I may even say, possible, to be the Case; so that your Distinction is only an *Ens Rationis*, which may be disputed of in Schools, but can never

never be brought into Practice upon the Stage of the World.

To conclude, I refer you to all the Old Statutes and Ancient Establishment of this Kingdom, and the Acts of Parliament of latter Years still in Force, which directly oppose your Doctrine of Resistance, and in these also you will see what profound Respect and Deference was paid to our Kings of the direct lineal Succession, all others that were Kings only *De Facto* being looked upon as Usurpers: And Sir George Mackenzie, that eminent and learned Lawier and Antiquary in his Defence of the Royal Line of *Scotland*, concludes thus;

‘ Having now cleared how our Nation arrived at its present Consistence, I am to finish this Discourse with a Representation of the many Rights which our Kings have to the Imperial Throne of those Kingdoms; and to show how they succeed to all who ever pretended to Monarchy in any of them.

‘ As to the *British* Part of the Isle, *Aurelius Ambrosius* was by common Consent chosen sole Prince of all the *Britains*; and he had no other Succession, save two Daughters, *Anna* married to the King of the *Picts*, and *Ada* married to the King of *Scots*. *Mordredus* King of the *Picts* Grand-child to the foresaid *Aurelius*, finding himself debarr’d from the Succession of the *British* Crown, employ’d the *Scots*, who fought for him against the *Britons*. But the *Britains* having called in the *Saxons*, after a Bloody Battle, both Parties were forced to withdraw, and the King of the *Picts* was obliged to desist from his Pretensions at that Time. But thereafter *Hungus* King of the *Picts*, and the direct Heir of the same *Mordredus*, and consequently of *Ambrosius* King of the *Britains*, gave his Sister *Fergusiana*

* *gusiana* to *Achaius* King of *Scots*, and in her Right
 * *Alpin* King of *Scotland* succeeded both to the *Pictish*
 * and *British* Crowns; *Hungus* having died without
 * any Children; *Kenneth* second Son to *Alpin*, was
 * forced to Conquer the *Picts*, who refused unjustly
 * to receive him as their lawul King.

* Our Kings are likewise Heirs of the *Danish* Race,
 * who were Kings of *England* 27, as others say 29
 * Years, they being the only Lineal Successour of
 * *Canutus* King of the *Danes* in *Britain*; for *Margaret*
 * Wife to King *Malcolm* III. was Sister to *Edgar*,
 * which *Edgar* was Grand-Child to *St. Edward*,
 * who was Brother to *Hardiknut* Son to *Canutus*.

* After this the Kingdom of *England* returned to
 * the old Stock in King *Edwards* Time, to whom suc-
 * ceeded *Edgar*, whose Sister the Pious Queen
 * *Margaret*, married King *Malcolm* III. of *Scotland*, by
 * whom he came to have Right to the Crown of
 * *England*, there being none extant of the old Royal
 * *Saxon* Line besides herself, and with her came
 * very many of the Nobility, who fled from *William*
 * the Conqueror after he had Conquered *England*,
 * and were with *Malcolm* who would not make
 * Peace, till such of them as resolved to return, were
 * restored to their Estates.

* The next Royal Race which flourished in *Eng-*
 * *land*, was the *Norman*, and to that Race our Kings
 * succeeded thus, The Line of *William* the Con-
 * queror was Branch'd out in the Houses of *Lancaster*
 * and *York*: To the House of *Lancaster*, they succeed-
 * ed as Heirs by the Marriage betwixt *Joan* Daugh-
 * ter to the Duke of *Somerset*, and undoubted Succes-
 * sor of the Family of *Lancaster*, and to both *Lancaster*
 * and *York* they succeeded, by being Heirs to *Henry*,
 * in whom these Successions were again happily re-
 * conciled

conciled, he having married *Elisabeth* eldest Daughter to *Edward IV.* who had transferred the Succession of the Crown from the House of *Lancaster*, to that of *York*, or at least had united the Two in One. For clearing whereof, it is fit to know, that *Henry VII.* had only four Children, *Arthur*, *Henry*, *Margaret* and *Mary*. *Arthur* and *Henry* dying without Succession, the Right of the Crown was certainly devolved over upon the Children of *Margaret* the Daughter, who did bear *James V.* in a first Marriage with *King James IV.* and *Margaret Douglass* by a second Marriage with the Earl of *Angus*: Which *Margaret* being married to *Matthew Earl of Lennox*, had two Sons, the eldest whereof was *Henry*, who thereafter married *Queen Mary* Daughter to *James V.* and begot upon her *James VI.* and thus *King James VI.* was upon all Sides Heir to *William* the Conquerour, and to *Henry VII.*

The Histories also of both Nations confess, that our King is the undoubted Successor of the Blood Royal of *Wales*: For *Walter Stewart* from whom our Kings are descended, was Grandchild to the King of *Wales*, by his Daughter, who married *Fleanchus* Son to *Banquhuo*; and *Henry VII.* (to whom *King James VI.* was the true Successor) was also the Righteous Heir of *Cadwalloder* the last Prince of *Wales*.

The Histories of both *Scotland* and *Ireland* do acknowledge, that our Kings are undoubtedly descended from the Royal Race of the Kings of *Ireland*; and all the Debate that can be, is only whether they be descended from *Farquhard* Father to *King Fergus*, or from *Eric* Father to *King Fergus II.* or from some *Irish* Kings, as *Usher* pretends.

(50)
From all which I may draw two Conclusions
First, That God has from an extraordinary Kind-
ness to those Kingdoms, lodged in the Person
of our present Sovereign King James VII. (whom
God Almighty long preserve) all those opposite
and different Rights, by which our Peace might
have been formerly disturbed. Secondly, That his
Majesty who now Reigns, has derived from his
Royal Ancestors, a just and legal Right by Law
to all those Crowns, without needing to found
upon the Right of Conquest: So that the very
Endeavour to exclude him from all those legal
Rights, by Arbitrary Intolence, under a Mask of
Law, was the height of Injustice as well as Im-
prudence.

And Now Mr. *Whig*, I have done what I can to
open your Eyes, wherein I have certainly succeed-
ed the Case being so very plain as the Light at
Noon-day. But, seeing you see not, neither will
you Understand, being given over to a reprobate
Sense. I therefore prefer the following Charge
and Indictment against you, and let the World
judge of the evidence brought for the Proof of it
in the fore-mentioned particular Facts charged upon
you, of which you have not been able to clear
your self; And therefore in all Law, Equity and
Justice, the Punishment due to such Offenders,
ought and should be inflicted upon you, to the
Terror of others to commit the like in time com-
ing. You stand indicted and accused as not having the
fear of God before your Eyes, but being wholly led by the
Instigation of the Devil, have traiterously and maliciously
conspired with other false Traitors against His Majesty
His Crown and Dignity, Him to Death and Destruction
to bring, and miserable Havock and Slaughter among the
Subjects.

51

Subjects of this Realm to make, &c. and all this as the natural and necessary Consequence of those Positions, set up and maintained by you and other your Accompllices of the Original of Power, and the last Resort of it being in the People; and giving them the Liberty of Resistance, against their lawful Sovereign, whereby their Consciences are set free from any Obligation to Obedience, and to take Arms against the Government, when ever they, or any of them shall think fit. And I further say, and have fully proven, That there is no Medium possible betwixt Non-resistance, upon any pretence whatsoever, and a full Licence to Resist. upon every Pretence whatsoever, because every Man is left to judge of the Pretence; So that the whole Dispute is, whether Government or Anarchy? Further more, That no Government ever yet did allow of Resistance against itself: And therefore, that the Doctrine of Resistance is inconsistent with any Government whatsoever. And it is Treason against all Governments upon the Face of the Earth, and ought to be declared Treason by every Government, whether vented by Word or Writing, or any other Way whatsoever. And whoever will not disown and abjure that Doctrine in most express Words, and willingly and freely, ought to be incapable of any Place or Office in the Government, since no Government can be safe with such; and all the Clergy who preach it, should be Excommunicated and degraded, as Trumpeters of Rebellion, and Wolves in Shepherds Cloathing. And Lastly, The Doctrine of Non-Resistance well deserves a Place in our Catechism, that the Young may be early instructed in so necessary and Christian a Doctrine. The not Understanding, or Neglect of which has ruined

(52)
many, both Souls and Bodies, and turned flourishing Nations into Aceldamas and Desolations.

The Witnesses to prove this Charge against your self Sir, and all the Cloud of Whig-Writers you refer me to, are,

Sam. Bochart Ep. pag. 32, 90, 61, 54, 55, 84, 86, 87.

Dr. Faulkner's *Christ: Loyalty*, V. 2. C. 2.
Sir Orl. Bridgeman's Speech to the *Regicides*, p. 12, 13.

The *Rehearsals* in answer to *Observers* and *DeFoes* Reviews.

Jovian in Answer to *Julian* the Apostate.

Salmasius in Answer to *Milton*.

Cook's Instit. p. 4. ch. 74. *ibid.* p. 359. *ibid.* p. 14. Ditto in *Calvins Case*, p. 439.

Chancellor *Fortescue de Laudibus Legum Angliae* c. 9.

Bracton lib. 1. c. 8. *ibid.* lib. 2. c.

Mr. Henry a Dissenting Preacher, his Commentary on the Bible.

Sheringham's Kings Supremacy, c. 3. 9.

Stanford's Expla. of the King's Prerog. cap. 22.

Judge *Jenkin's*, p. 19.

Bishop *Bilson* in his Defences between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion, printed 1586, p. 260, 256, 279.

Bishop *Ferwel* in Defence of the Apology, Arch-

Arch-Bishop *Sandy's* Sermons.

Dr. *Willet* upon Rom. 13.

Dr. *Hakerwel's* Scutum.

Erasm. in *Luc.* 22. 36.

Hugo Grotius, his Commentaries on the Bible.

Sir *George Maskenzie*,

All the Primitive *Christians* and *Martyrs*, and those that suffered *Martyrdom* in the Days, and under the Reign of *Q. Mary*, without the least Resistance, or any Inclination to it.

And now, Sir, I have done with you, and even take your Fate, if you escape Punishment without Repentance, it is more than I can think of; but surely your safest Way will be, to Repent and Return to their Church, else you are not fit to live under any Government; and your best Way in that Case will be, to transport your self to that uncivilized Place you have been contending for, where you will meet with your Friends, *The Independent-State of-Nature-Men*: But, lest you should not know your own Country, I'll describe it to you.

Its Name is *Chaos*, and situated out of the Creation, which it complains of as an Encroachment upon its Territories. The Inhabitants are *Præ-adamites*, for there are none other without Government, they have all one Name, whence

whence their Government (for they also have a shadow of it) is called *Anarchy*. They Worship; two Idols, one is called *Behai*, the God of Liberty. The other *Beelzebub*, the God of Flies, for these Inhabitants are a great swarm of Flies, running thro' one another in Confusion, without any Superiority or Subjection among them, and their tumultuary Buzz, is called, *The Voice of the People*. They have a High Priest called *Ignorance*, which is the Mother of their Devotion, and continually prays for his own Establishment; unless you Name *Rule* or *Order*, or *Government*; This they will not bear, they call it clipping their *Wings*, and introducing of *Arbitrary Power*; but it is high Treason to pronounce the Word *Principle*, instead of which, they always read *Precedents*, of which they have very Ancient Ones. They once raised a Civil War in *Heaven*, but were worsted there, and ever since hate the Name *Monarchy*; but they have made great Inroads upon *Earth* among the *Greeks* and *Romans* formerly, and now in *Poland*, *Spain*, *Hungary*, &c. They once had *England* in their Possession, and hoped to have it to again, and to perpetuate their Succession, for which End, they have seized some of our Churches already and the Pulpit bears Time to the scandalous Club of Scriblers for *Anarchy*, and every one is knockt down that offers to put us in mind of *Divine Right*, and preaching the *Doctrine of our Church*! So I wish you, and all the *Wings* a good Journey.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

P Age 8. Line 24. for *Superior* read *Supreme*. P. 16. L. 33. for *Monarchy* read *Anarchy*. P. 21. L. 24. for *came* read *come*. P. 37. L. 28. *dele* never.

